Amendment Dated: June 6, 2007

Reply to Office Action Mailed: March 8, 2007

Attorney Docket No. 101248.55500US

REMARKS

Favorable consideration and allowance of claims 1-4 are requested in view

of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over

Ishii et al. (US 2002/0038692) in view of Suzuki et al. (US 6,652,709). Applicants

respectfully traverse the rejection as set forth below.

As a preliminary matter, Applicants note that Mr. Nobuo Ishii, an

inventor of the present invention, is one of the two inventors of the Ishii et al.

reference cited in the Office Action. The present invention provides further

improvement on the plasma processing apparatus disclosed in the Ishii et al.

reference, and particularly discloses a structure for more strongly coupling the

first standing wave formed in the radial waveguide and the second standing

wave formed in the portion containing the top plate portion and the antenna

portion.

In a plasma processing apparatus, the plasma production region within a

chamber is maintained by the mutual coupling of the first and second standing

waves. If the mutual coupling thereof is weak, there is a tendency that the

second standing wave predominantly contributes to maintenance of the plasma

production region. However, the second standing wave is liable to vary

depending on a process condition such as a pressure in the chamber, and if the

second standing wave varies, it becomes difficult to control the electromagnetic

Page 5 of 9

Amendment Dated: June 6, 2007

Reply to Office Action Mailed: March 8, 2007

Attorney Docket No. 101248.55500US

field, which forms the plasma production region. This causes a problem of

variations in etching rate or film deposition rate (see the "Background Art"

section of the specification).

To overcome such a problem, the invention according to claim 1 in the

present application is directed to a structure that satisfies the formula ((B - A)/2

= $(\lambda_g/2) \cdot N$) recited in claim 1, so as to couple the first and second standing wave

more strongly. In the formula, A is the inner diameter of the radial waveguide,

B is the inner diameter of the antenna portion, λ_g is wavelength of the hig-

frequency electromagnetic field and N is zero or a natural number. As described

below, this formula cannot be conceived from the Suzuki et al. reference, which

discloses a plasma processing apparatus that forms standing waves in a

circumferential direction.

Initially, the Office Action asserts that the Ishii et al. reference discloses

the features of claim 1, except for relative dimensions of the inner diameter A of

the radial waveguide and the inner diameter B of the portion containing the top

plate portion of the antenna portion. Further, the Office Action asserts that the

Suzuki et al. reference discloses a specific dimensional relationship between the

dielectric window (top plate portion) 4 and the microwave applicator (circular

waveguide) 3, contending that one skilled in the art would have conceived the

present invention by applying the dimensional relationship to the Ishii et al.

reference.

Page 6 of 9

Amendment Dated: June 6, 2007

Reply to Office Action Mailed: March 8, 2007

Attorney Docket No. 101248.55500US

In the plasma processing apparatus disclosed in the Ishii et al. reference,

the electromagnetic fields that have propagated in the radial waveguide 36

propagate in the antenna portion in a radial direction to form standing waves of

a high-frequency electromagnetic field in a region S1 containing the antenna

portion and the top plate portion arranged with a space therebetween (see

paragraph [0098] in the specification). Accordingly, in the plasma processing

apparatus in the Ishii et al. reference, standing waves of the high-frequency

electromagnetic field are formed in a radial direction.

By contrast, in the plasma processing apparatus of the Suzuki et al.

reference, there is provided a microwave applicator 3 for introducing microwaves

into the plasma generation chamber 9 (see Figs. 6A-6B and lines 32-51 of column

11 in the specification). The microwaves that have propagated in the junction

circuit (waveguide) 15 propagate in the microwave applicator 3 in a

circumferential direction (see Figs. 5A and lines 1-42 of column 7 in the

specification). Accordingly, in this plasma processing apparatus, standing waves

are formed in a circumferential direction of the microwave applicator 3. In other

words, the manner by which standing waves of the high-frequency

electromagnetic field are generated in Suzuki et al. is completely different from

Ishii et al.

Furthermore, in the plasma processing apparatus in the Suzuki et al.

reference, the dielectric window 4 is arranged immediately below the microwave

Page 7 of 9

Amendment Dated: June 6, 2007

Reply to Office Action Mailed: March 8, 2007

Attorney Docket No. 101248.55500US

applicator 3, and microwaves in the circular waveguide are directly introduced

from a slot 23 into the chamber through the dielectric window 4. In this plasma

processing apparatus, no space is provided between the microwave applicator 3

and the dielectric window 4, and hence there is no disclosure or suggestion of

forming standing waves of microwaves in such a region.

In view of the foregoing, there is no teaching, suggestion or motivation for

associating the dimensional relationship of the structure where standing waves

are formed in such a circumferential direction with the dimensional relationship

of the structure where standing waves are formed in a radial direction.

Furthermore, it cannot be conceived to allow the Ishii et al. reference,

which has regions where the first and second standing waves are formed,

respectively, to satisfy the formula recited in claim 1, based on the dimensional

relationship in the Suzuki et al. reference. The dielectric window 4 of Suzuki et

al. is arranged immediately below the microwave applicator 3, and thus the

structure of Suzuki et al. fails to have a region corresponding to the region as

described in the Ishii et al. reference where the second standing wave is formed.

Accordingly, Suzuki's structure is not designed to form standing waves in such a

region.

In view of the foregoing, even if the teachings of the Suzuki et al. reference

were combined with the teachings of the Ishii et al. reference, the structure

satisfying the formula recited in claim 1 would not be achieved. Therefore, claim

Page 8 of 9

Amendment Dated: June 6, 2007

Reply to Office Action Mailed: March 8, 2007

Attorney Docket No. 101248.55500US

1 and its dependent claims 2-4 are patentable over the combination of Ishii et al.

and Suzuki et al.

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in

general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this

should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as

a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and

please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit

Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #101248.55500US).

Respectfully submitted,

W. BU

June 6, 2007

Jeffrey D. Sanok

Registration No. 32,169

Cameron W. Beddard

Registration No. 46,545

CROWELL & MORING LLP

Intellectual Property Group

P.O. Box 14300

Washington, DC 20044-4300

Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500

Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844

JDS:CWB:crr

3298173